



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,286	03/16/2001	Jacques Fieschi	FR920000012US1	5924

7590 10/15/2004

ANDREW CALDER
MCGUIRE WOOD LLP
1750 TYSONS BLVD
SUITE 1800
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

WORJLOH, JALATEE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 10/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/810,286

Applicant(s)

FIESCHI ET AL.

Examiner

Jalatee Worjloh

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 2, 2004 as been entered.

Oath/Declaration

2. The Declaration filed on June 29, 2004 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Krueger et al. reference (US Publication No. 2002/0077837).

3. Claims 1-20 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6327578 to Linehan in view of US Patent No. 6748367 to Lee.

Linehan discloses registering a purchase of at least one article by a buyer using a credit/debit card associated with at least one PIN code at a seller terminal connected to an electronic payment center (i.e. "issuer gateway") by a communication network (see col. 7, lines 39-42 and 55-66), checking, by the electronic payment center, that the at least one PIN code

Art Unit: 3621

which is provided by said buyer to said electronic payment center is associated with the number of said credit/debit card provided by said buyer to said seller terminal (see col. 8, lines 55-57).

Linehan does not expressly disclose checking, by said electronic payment center, with a third party whether the said at least one PIN code is valid. Lee discloses checking, by said electronic payment center, with a third party whether the said at least one PIN code is valid (see col. 11, lines 18-23). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Linehan to include the step of checking, by said electronic payment center, with a third party whether the said at least one PIN code is valid. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides additional security, consequently minimizing fraud.

Referring to claim 2, Linehan discloses the buyer has a terminal (i.e. “consumer computer”), which is connected to a communication network and said terminal is configured to transmit the credit/debit card (i.e. “consumer identity and authentication information”), see col. 4, lines 19-24 and col. 7, lines 39-42.

Referring to claim 3, Linehan discloses the credit/debit card number which has been provided to said seller terminal by said buyer is transmitted to said electronic payment center to check whether the PIN code provided by said buyer is associated with said credit/debit card number (see claim 1 above).

Referring to claim 8, Linehan and Lee disclose a system for validating an electronic payment by a credit/debit card comprising means adapted for carrying out the steps of the method according to claims 1 or 2 (see claim 1 above).

Art Unit: 3621

Referring to claim 9, Linehan discloses receiving transaction information from a buyer and a seller by an electronic payment center, performing a first validation with the transaction information from the buyer and seller by the electronic payment center and processing the sale by an electronic transaction upon authentication by the first validation (see col. 7, lines 39-42,55-67; col. 8, lines 1-15,55-57). Linehan does not expressly disclose requesting, by the electronic payment center, further validation from a third party to provide authentication by an electronic transaction and processing the sale by an electronic transaction upon authentication by the further validation. Lee discloses requesting, by the electronic payment center, further validation from a third party to provide authentication by an electronic transaction and processing the sale by an electronic transaction upon authentication by the further validation (see col. 11, lines 18-23). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Linehan to include requesting, by the electronic payment center, further validation from a third party to provide authentication by an electronic transaction and processing the sale by an electronic transaction upon authentication by the further validation. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because provides additional security, thereby reducing fraud.

Referring to claims 10 and 11, Linehan discloses the transaction information sent by the buyer is at least one article information, date and time of purchase, buyer PIN code, and credit/debit card number and the transaction information sent by the seller is at least one article information, date and time of purchase, and PIN code; wherein the article information includes purchase price (see col. 4, lines 10-17).

Art Unit: 3621

6. Claims 4,5, 13, 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linehan and Lee as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 5999624 to Hopkins.

Linehan discloses electronic payment center (see claim 1 above). Linehan does not expressly disclose the payment center checks in at least one profile table whether said PIN code is associated with the credit/debit card number. Hopkins discloses the payment center checks in at least one profile table whether said PIN code is associated with the credit/debit card number (see col. 9, lines 58-62). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Linehan to include the step wherein the electronic payment center checks in at least one profile table whether said PIN code is associated with the credit/debit card number. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because verifies the user's identity, thereby minimizing fraud.

Referring to claim 5, Linehan discloses checking by said electronic payment center whether the amount of said purchase of the at least one article is below a maximum amount authorized for the at least one PIN code (see col. 4, lines 28 & 29).

Referring to claims 13 and 14, Linehan discloses electronic payment center (see claim 1 above). Linehan does not expressly disclose the payment center comparing at least one portion of the transaction information with profile table information. Hopkins discloses the payment center comparing at least one portion of the transaction information with profile table information; wherein the profile table information comprises at least one of a credit/debit card number a buyer PIN code, and an authorization amount corresponding to the buyer Pin code (see col. 9, lines 58-62). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person

Art Unit: 3621

of ordinary skill in the art to include the step wherein the payment center compares at least one portion of the transaction information with profile table information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it verifies the user's identity, thereby minimizing fraud.

Referring 20, Linehan discloses the payment center verifying the consumer's account has sufficient funds (see col. 4, lines 28-30). Linehan does not expressly disclose sending an error message to the buyer if the amount is outside an authorized limit. Hopkins discloses sending an error message to the buyer if the amount is outside an authorized limit (see col.9, lines 58-67; col. 10, lines 1-4). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Linehan to include the step of sending an error message to the buyer if the amount is outside an authorized limit. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides excellent customer service by notifying the consumer.

7. Claims 6,7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linehan, Lee and Hopkins as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 6205437 to Gifford.

Linehan discloses electronic payment center (see claim 5 above). Linehan does not expressly disclose checking by said electronic payment center whether there is a prevalidation of the purchase of the at least one article by the buyer. Gifford discloses checking by said electronic payment center whether there is a prevalidation of the purchase of the at least one article by the buyer (see col.7, lines 40-61), wherein said prevalidation of the purchase of the at

Art Unit: 3621

least one article by said buyer is cleared after it has been used (see col. 8, liens 51-65). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Linehan to include the step of checking by said electronic payment center whether there is a prevalidation of the purchase of the at least one article by the buyer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it eliminates duplicate charges to the consumer account.

Referring to claim 15, Linehan discloses electronic payment center (see claim 9 above). Linehan does not expressly disclose the electronic payment center clears the one portion of transaction information form the third party. Gifford discloses the electronic payment center clears the one portion of transaction information form the third party (see col. 7, lines 40-61). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Linehan to allow the payment center to clear the at least one portion of transaction information from the third party. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it eliminates duplicate charges to the consumer account.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linehan and Lee as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Gifford.

Linehan disclose the seller receiving a start message (see col. 11 above). Linehan does not expressly disclose the start message includes a credit/debit card number, an article identification, a transaction time, a transaction date, and a buyer PIN code from the buyer. Gifford discloses receiving a credit/debit card number, an article identification, a transaction time, a transaction date, and a buyer PIN code from the buyer (i.e. "payment order"), see col. 6, liens 16-32. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of

Art Unit: 3621

ordinary skill in the art to modify method disclose by Linehan to include a credit/debit card number, an article identification, a transaction time, a transaction date, and a buyer PIN code from the buyer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides detail transaction information necessary for processing the transaction.

9. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linehan in view of Gifford.

Referring to claim 16, Linehan discloses receiving transaction information from a buyer and a seller by an electronic payment center, performing a validation with the transaction information from the buyer and seller by the electronic payment center and providing authentication for a sale by an electronic transaction when the validation provide authorization (see col. 7, lines 39-42,55-67; col. 8, lines 1-15,55-57). Linehan does not expressly disclose performing a pre-validation of buyer information with a third party and providing authentication for a sale by an electronic transaction when the prevalidation provide authorization. Gifford discloses performing a pre-validation of buyer information with a third party and providing authentication for a sale by an electronic transaction when the prevalidation provide authorization (see col. 7, lines 40-61). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Linehan to include the step of performing a pre-validation of buyer information with a third party and providing authentication for a sale by an electronic transaction when the prevalidation provide authorization. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because provides additional security, thereby reducing fraud.

10. Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linehan and Gifford as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Hopkins.

Linehan discloses determining by the electronic payment center, whether the amount charged to the credit card number is within an authorized limit (see col. 4, lines 28-30). Linehan does not expressly disclose determining, by the electronic payment center, whether the amount charged to the credit card number is within an authorized limit, if a PIN code of the transaction information is verified. Hopkins discloses determining, by the electronic payment center, whether the amount charged to the credit card number is within an authorized limit, if a PIN code of the transaction information is verified (see col. 9, lines 68-67). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Linehan to include the step of determining, by the electronic payment center, whether the amount charged to the credit card number is within an authorized limit, if a PIN code of the transaction information is verified. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it ensures that the merchant receives compensation for the service provided.

Referring to claim 18, Linehan discloses a payment center (see claim 17 above). Linehan does not expressly disclose checking for the prevalidation of the PIN code when the amount charged to the credit card number is within an authorized amount. Gifford discloses checking for the prevalidation of the PIN code when the amount charged to the credit card number is within an authorized amount (see col. 7, lines 40-61). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Linehan to include the step of checking for the prevalidation of the PIN code when the amount charged to the credit card number is within an authorized amount. One of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 3621

art would have been motivated to do this because it reduces fraud by verifying the user's identity.

Referring to claim 19, Linehan discloses the payment center verifying the consumer's account has sufficient funds (see col. 4, lines 28-30). Linehan does not expressly disclose sending an error message to the buyer if the amount is outside an authorized limit. Hopkins discloses sending an error message to the buyer if the amount is outside an authorized limit (see col.9, lines 58-67; col. 10, lines 1-4). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Linehan to include the step of sending an error message to the buyer if the amount is outside an authorized limit. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it provides excellent customer service by notifying the consumer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jalatee Worjloh whose telephone number is 703-305-0057. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Thursdays 8:30 - 7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 703-305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306 for Regular and After Final Actions and 703-746-9443 for Non-Official/Draft.

Art Unit: 3621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450***

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, V.A., Seventh floor receptionist.

October 4, 2004

JAMES P.
SUPERVISORY F
TECHNOLOG

REH